4.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

4.1 CEQA APPENDIX G: ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title:
Lakeville-Sonoma 115 kV Transmission Line Project

2. Lead agency name and address:
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

3. Contact person and phone number:
[CPUC to identify]

4. Project location:
Sonoma County, California.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
245 Market Street, N10A
San Francisco, CA 94105

6. General plan designation:
Public/Quasi Public land use designations for transmission line corridor and substations.

7. Zoning: Public Facilities

8. Project Description:
Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) seeks to upgrade the electric transmission system in southern Sonoma County by installing a new 115 kV circuit between the existing Lakeville Substation near Petaluma and the existing Sonoma Substation in Sonoma (the "Lakeville-Sonoma 115 kV Transmission Line Project"). In order to mitigate potential environmental impacts of the project, PG&E proposes to co-locate the Lakeville-Sonoma project with an existing 115 kV circuit rather than creating an entirely new transmission corridor.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:
The project area primarily includes open space, rolling hills, and vineyards, with smaller amounts of residential and commercial development.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required
A list of permitting and approval agencies is provided in Chapter 2, Table 2-6.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

■ Aesthetics	■ Agriculture Resources	■ Air Quality
■ Biological Resources	■ Cultural Resources	■ Geology /Soils
■ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	■ Hydrology / Water Quality	■ Land Use / Planning
□ Mineral Resources	■ Noise	□ Population / Housing
□ Public Services	□ Recreation	■ Transportation/Traffic
□ Utilities / Service Systems	□ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

□ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

■ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

□ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

□ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

□ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature	Date
Signature	Date

4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

4.2.1 Aesthetics

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	■	☐
	a) The project will replace an existing transmission line that parallels several Sonoma County scenic corridors and a City of Sonoma "gateway" designated at Sonoma Creek and Leveroni Road. The line also crosses over scenic hillsides and ridges. As the project will replace the existing single-circuit transmission line with a double-circuit line featuring slightly taller poles, it would not constitute a substantial visual change from any scenic vista. However, mitigation measures are outlined in Chapter 16 to minimize visual impacts.			
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	■
	b) The project will not be visible from a state scenic highway.			
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	■	☐
	c) The project area consists in large part of open space, natural landscapes, and vineyards, with some suburban and rural residential development. As the project will replace an existing single-circuit transmission line with a double-circuit line featuring slightly taller poles, it would not constitute a substantial visual change and thus would not significantly degrade the existing visual character and quality of the project area.			
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	■	☐
	d) The project would not result in a new source of substantial light that would impact day or nighttime views. A small amount of additional lighting would be installed at the Lakeville Substation, but the impact would be less than significant.			

4.2.2 Agricultural Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	■	☐
	a) Only about one-third acre (0.316-acre) of "prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance" will be converted for the project, mainly for footprints of poles and short segments of permanent dirt access roads leading up to the poles. Although there will be 20 fewer poles with the replacement line, the tubular steel poles will require concrete foundations, which have a slightly larger footprint than wood poles directly embedded in soil. As there are large amounts of farmland in the project area and larger region that are protected by strong local government land use policies, the small amount of farmland that would be used for the project would be negligible and less than significant. Farm operators/land owners would be compensated for the value of agricultural crops / land used for the project.			
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	■	☐
	b) Several parcels within the project area are currently under Williamson Act contract. The placement of transmission poles on land currently under Williamson Act contract will not remove the land from Williamson Act contract status. Pursuant to Government Code Section 51238, placement of electric facilities on Williamson Act land is a compatible use. The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with any Williamson Act contract.			
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	■	☐

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c) Construction and pole locations have been designed to avoid farmland to the extent possible, and the majority of such areas would be restored following project construction. Once constructed, the project would use a minimal amount (39 square feet) of additional "other" farmland (i.e., local farmland not designated as prime, unique or of statewide importance). Property owners or farm owners would be provided with monetary compensation. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.			

4.2.3 Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
	a) Construction and operation of the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan, thus there would be no impact.			
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	■	☐	☐
	b) Project construction would include the temporary use of heavy equipment and motor vehicles, resulting in an increase in reactive organic gasses (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), sulfur oxides (SO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM_{10}). Best Management Practices for air quality would be followed as outlined in Chapter 5, reducing emissions in a way that would not create or contribute significantly to any violation of air quality standards. In addition, project operation would result in only negligible emissions associated with less than 100 vehicle-miles per month. Annual inspections are already performed with the existing transmission line. Future maintenance activities would be even less frequent with fewer poles and the use of tubular steel poles, which require less maintenance. The project would therefore have less than significant impacts following mitigation for construction-related emissions.			

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	■	☐	☐
	c) Temporary emissions associated with project construction would be mitigated to less than significant levels, and emissions associated with project operation would be negligible. The project would result in negligible impacts to air quality following mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 5. Thus the project would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation.			
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	■	☐	☐
	d) The project would not expose sensitive receptors (e.g., children, the elderly, the infirm) to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant with mitigation (e.g., dust control during construction).			
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	■	☐
	e) Minor objectionable odors may be generated during construction activities due to equipment emissions and other minor sources. These odors would be dispersed within a short distance of construction sites, and all impacts associated with odors would be less than significant.			

4.2.4 Biological Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	■	☐	☐

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Project construction has the potential to impact rare, threatened or endangered species of plant and animals as described in detail in Chapter 6. Avoidance and protection measures outlined in Chapter 6 and additional measures developed as appropriate in coordination with resource agencies would reduce these potential impacts to less than significant levels.			
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	■	☐	☐
	b) Project related construction would result in impacts to riparian habitat and oak woodlands, and could have temporary impacts on vernal pool habitats. Impacts would be limited only to areas that could not be spanned or avoided. Mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.			
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	■	☐	☐
	c) Project construction could result in temporary impacts to wetlands, creeks or other Waters of the U.S. Proposed road crossings of minor drainages could result in temporary or permanent impacts to small areas of water that may be subject to federal jurisdiction. Mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.			
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	■	☐
	d) Project construction should not require any obstruction of stream flows and therefore would not impede the movement of migratory fish. The project also would not interfere with terrestrial wildlife nursery sites or established migratory corridors.			
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	■	☐	☐

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	e) Tree trimming/removal for project construction, fire protection and line clearance required by state law could impact trees protected by the County or City of Sonoma. Potential impacts to protected trees will be less than significant with mitigation.			
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
	f) The project would not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.			

4.2.5 Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Sec. 15064.5?	☐	☐	■	☐
	a) The existing Lakeville-Sonoma transmission line is within the distant background of the viewshed of the Petaluma Adobe building (State Historic Landmark No. 18). However, raising the existing transmission line poles in this area by about 29 feet higher (on average) is not expected to create a significant visual impact from the building, as they are largely screened by vegetation and are located a good distance away, approximately 1,600 feet northeast of the park. In addition, other lattice tower transmission lines closer to the park are far more prominent visually than the Lakeville-Sonoma transmission line in the distance. The project would not substantially degrade the existing viewshed. The project would have a less than significant visual impact to the Petaluma Adobe building. No mitigation is required. In order to create a permanent access road, a physical breach will be made to a portion of an historic stone wall. The stone wall does not appear on historic maps of the Napa area, does not line up with known Mexican Land Grant boundaries and is of a type, style and method of construction common in the region. As this is a non-significant historic resource, impacts are considered less-than-significant.			
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Sec. 15064.5?	☐	■	☐	☐

	b) Although no known archaeological resources (other than the Petaluma Adobe and a stone wall discussed above) were identified in the project impact area, the project could potentially pass through areas of unknown archeological significance. Because impacts would be mitigated if unknown archaeological resources are discovered during construction, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.			
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	■
	c) The project would not destroy any known unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature and therefore would cause no impact.			
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	■
	d) The project would not pass through any cemetery, and no unknown burial grounds are anticipated along the project route. The project would therefore have no impact.			

4.2.6 Geology and Soils

Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	■	☐	☐
	a) The project is located within a geologic environment that could expose project components to fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, and landslides. However, with proper mitigation, such as careful location of transmission structures and appropriate engineering design of substation and transmission components, the risk from potential geologic hazards would be less than significant.			
b) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	■	☐	☐
	b) A portion of the project area is near the Rodgers Creek segment of the Hayward-Rodgers Creek fault which is associated with an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designation. However, with geotechnical investigations and proper engineering, any impacts from a significant rupture would be less than significant.			

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	■	☐	☐
	c) The project route crosses known active faults with potential fault rupture hazards, such as the Rodgers Creek fault, and to a lesser extent, the West Napa, Soda Creek and unnamed faults west of the Carneros fault. This area of northern California, as all of the greater Bay Area, is subject to periodic large and major earthquake events and their resulting strong seismic ground shaking. However, with proper mitigation, such as careful location of transmission structures and appropriate engineering design of substation and transmission components, the risk from potential geologic hazards would be less than significant.			
d) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	■	☐	☐
	d) Some of the low-lying areas of the project area are subject to a low to moderate risk of liquefaction. However, with careful location of transmission structures and appropriate engineering design of substation and transmission components, the risk from potential geologic hazards would be less than significant.			
e) Landslides?	☐	☐	■	☐
	e) Hilly portions of the project area are subject to landslide activity. The project features would be sited in manner that would <u>not</u> expose them to steep slopes or areas of unstable soils. Therefore, landslide potential would be less than significant.			
f) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	■	☐	☐
	f) Project construction at pole sites and use of existing or new access roads has the potential to temporarily increase soil erosion. Additionally, transmission structures and grading for substations could result in the loss of topsoil resources at those locations. However, implementing erosion control measures contained in PG&E's Best Management Practices manual result in less than significant levels of erosion.			
g) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	■	☐	☐

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	g) The project area contains local areas of unstable geologic and soil units. Through proper location and detailed geotechnical investigations of substation sites, access roads, and transmission pole locations, these areas would be avoided and pose a less than significant impact. Additionally, the project would not cause lateral spreading or liquefaction, which are secondary effects of strong seismic activity. Likewise, the project would not cause subsidence or collapse. Construction of access roads would have the potential to initiate or reactivate unstable slopes if not avoided, but these areas would be avoided by careful location, design and construction of access roads and other project components, resulting in a less than significant impact.			
h) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	■	☐
	h) Expansive soils are found throughout the project area. However, they are considered a less than significant impact, or rather a constraint to the project, as transmission structures are generally founded at depths below surficial expansive soils and are not generally affected by their expansive nature. In addition, engineering design, based on geotechnical recommendations of substation sites, would reduce the remaining possible effects of expansive soils to less than significant.			
i) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	■
	i) The project will not install septic tank systems or require alternative wastewater disposal systems.			

4.2.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	■	☐

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Project operation would not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of significant amounts of hazardous materials. Hazardous material use would be mainly associated with occasional maintenance and repair activities to the transmission line. However, use of these materials would be similar to what is done with the existing transmission line. Hazardous materials handling, transportation and disposal regulations would be followed. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.			
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	■	☐
	b) Project construction would involve the use of motor-driven vehicles and equipment, and possible use of herbicides, presenting a minor potential for spills of gasoline, oil, antifreeze, and other associated chemicals. The risk of a spill and the potential spill size are minor, and impacts would be less than significant.			
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	■	☐	☐
	c) There is a small church school on Highway 12, south of Leveroni / Napa Road, which is about 0.20-mile southeast of the Sonoma Substation (see Figure 11-1). As construction activities will involve some hazardous emissions from vehicles and handling of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of this school, this is considered a potentially significant impact. However, preparation of a Hazardous Substance Control and Emergency Response Plan, the school's distance from the construction corridor, prevailing westerly winds, and the fact that construction equipment will only be in the area temporarily would result in a less than significant impact.			
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	■
	d) The project would not pass through any listed hazardous materials sites, and would therefore have no impact associated with hazardous materials sites.			

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	■
	e) The project would not pass through an airport land use area or within two miles of a public or public-use airport, therefore there would be no impact.			
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	■
	f) The project would not pass within two miles of a known private airstrip, therefore there would be no impact.			
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
	g) The project would not interfere with or impair implementation of any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, there would be no impact.			
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	■	☐	☐
	h) The project could expose structures, including transmission poles and substation facilities, to a risk of loss or damage involving wildland fires. PG&E performs vegetation clearance and tree trimming to reduce fuel materials under and around transmission lines, which helps reduce fire risks. Impacts associated with fire hazards would be mitigated to a less than significant level.			

4.2.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	■	☐

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Project construction would result in temporary and minor increases in sedimentation and possible temporary and minor release of additional water pollutants. However, project operation would not result in any pollutant discharge. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and would have less than significant impacts to standards and discharge requirements due to temporary sedimentation and discharge.			
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	■	☐
	b) Project construction would not include a substantial increase in impermeable surfaces, as all substations and access road surfaces would consist primarily of dirt or gravel. In addition, project operation would not involve the use of groundwater. Thus, all impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant.			
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	■	☐
	c) Construction of other project features, including transmission corridors, access roads, and transmission poles, would result in minor alterations to additional drainages and minor increases in erosion and siltation. None of these actions would alter the course of a stream or river. Implementing mitigation measures discussed in Chapter 10 will further ensure that erosion and siltation will be less than significant.			
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	■	☐
	d) Construction of other project features, including transmission corridors, access roads, and transmission poles, would result in minor alterations to additional drainages. Because the areas where runoff would be increased are small and isolated, impacts associated with increase runoff would be less than significant.			

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	■	☐
	e) The project would increase runoff in some areas, but these areas are small and are located mostly in open space and rural areas without stormwater drainage systems. Impacts associated with stormwater drainage capacity are therefore less than significant. Furthermore, the project would provide only small and minor additional sources of polluted runoff and impacts associated with polluted runoff would be less than significant.			
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	■	☐
	f) The project would not include any components that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality.			
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	■
	g) The project would not include construction of housing, and would therefore have no impact associated with placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.			
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	■
	h) The project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard zone. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.			
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	■
	i) The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Thus, there would be no impact.			
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	■	☐
	j) The project area is not subject to inundation by seiche or tsunami and would therefore have no impact. Local areas in project area may experience mudflow hazards, but previous statement under IV Geology and Soils e) Landslides addresses this and explains that it is less than significant.			

4.2.9 Land Use and Planning

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	■
	a) The proposed project would replace an existing transmission line that traverses open space, agricultural lands, and parallels a roadway that passes through low-density residential areas. Like the existing transmission line, the proposed project would not impede movement under the line or affect the unity of an established community. Thus, there will be no impact on or division of established communities.			
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	■	☐
	b) The project would replace an existing single-circuit 115 kV transmission line with a double-circuit 115 kV transmission line, which would require slight expansion of the existing right-of-way in some locations, but this is not expected to create significant new land use impacts or conflicts. The proposed project would replace an existing transmission line in an already-established utility corridor, thus avoiding the need to create a new utility corridor in scenic open space or greenbelt areas, which is consistent with Sonoma County and City of Sonoma general plan policies. The project will not create significant visual impacts at the City of Sonoma's designated Leveroni Road/Sonoma Creek "gateway" or "scenic vista" on Leveroni Road as existing riparian vegetation and tall trees will help screen the transmission line. Replacement of transmission poles and substation modifications would not substantially degrade existing conditions at the Four Corners (Highway 12/Broadway/Leveroni/Napa Road) "gateway." These project components are set back one half block from the intersection. Visual impacts to Sonoma County scenic landscape units would be less than significant, as the double-circuit line would replace an existing transmission line, and thus only create an incremental visual change. The project design (thin pole type and brown color) will help the transmission line blend into the hillsides. Sonoma County's General Plan contains a goal to "Consider requiring the under-grounding of new electrical transmission and distribution lines where appropriate in designated open			

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	space areas and in selected urban areas. Where feasible and under Public Utility Commission (PUC) rules, convert existing overhead lines to underground facilities in urban areas." Undergrounding of the project is not warranted, as project modifications will not create a significant visual impact or substantial change in the visual character of the existing environmental baseline. There is already an existing transmission line, as well as multiple distribution lines, in the utility corridor. Thus the project is consistent with Sonoma County and City of Sonoma General Plan policies related to public utilities.			
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
	c) The project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, and would therefore have no impact associated with such plans.			

4.2.10 Mineral Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	■
	a) The project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource, and would have no impact associated with the availability of mineral resources.			
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
	b) The project would not result in the loss of any locally important mineral resource recovery site, and would have no impact associated with mineral resource recovery and recovery sites.			

4.2.11 Noise

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	■	☐	☐
a) Project construction would include the operation of heavy equipment near residential areas, which would generate a substantial amount of noise that may exceed established standards. The project therefore poses a potentially significant impact associated with temporary construction-related noise generation. However, with mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 12, these impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels.				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	■	☐	☐
b) Erection of transmission poles and substation equipment would involve digging, drilling, and grading activities that could result in potentially significant groundborne vibration and noise. However, by following the mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 12, these levels will be reduced to a less than significant level.				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Project operation would not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity.				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	■	☐	☐
d) Project construction would include the operation of helicopters, which would constitute a substantial temporary increase in the ambient noise environment. The project would therefore result in potentially significant impacts associated with a temporary increase in noise levels in the project area. These impacts can be mitigated to less than significant.				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or public-use airport, and would have no impact on the noise environment in such areas.				

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	■
	f) The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would have no impact on the noise environment in such areas.			

4.2.12 Population and Housing

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	■	☐
	a) The project will not induce substantial population growth. The project is designed to increase the reliability of the electric system for the existing population by addressing an existing voltage problem and to meet near future demands to the electric system in the Napa-Sonoma region, thus accommodating planned population growth and development by local land use entities (e.g., Sonoma County and City of Sonoma). The project would be growth accommodating not growth inducing, and thus would be a less than significant impact**.**			
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	■
	b) The project would not displace any existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing, therefore having no impact.			
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	■
	c) The project would not displace any persons nor require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, therefore having no impact.			

4.2.13 Public Services

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	☐	☐	☐	■
	a) The project would not impact any public services, including fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. Thus, there would be no impact on public services.			
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	■
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	■
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	■
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	■
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	■

4.2.14 Recreation

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	■
	a) The project would not result in the increased use of existing or regional parks or other recreation facilities, and would have no such impact on parks and facilities.			
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	■

b) The project would not include any recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, and would have no impact on the environment associated with any such expansion or construction.

4.2.15 Transportation and Traffic

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	■	☐
a) Project construction would result in an increase in traffic associated with construction equipment and workers and during construction of transmission lines that cross or parallel roadways. Though construction would not require blocking entire roadways, construction activity and associated vehicles are anticipated to temporarily increase traffic along some roadways in the project area but would be a less than significant impact.				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) The project would not lead to an exceedence of a level of service standard for any designated road or highway. Increased traffic during construction would result in less than significant impacts to level of service standards throughout the project area. A Traffic Control Plan will be filed with the Sonoma County Transportation Department.				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) The project would have no impact on air traffic patterns, levels, or safety, as the proposed project is not in the vicinity of any airport or airstrip and towers would not be so tall as to impact flight patterns.				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	■	☐

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	d) The project would not increase hazards due to any transportation features. Incompatible uses associated with the project, such as use by construction equipment and transport of transmission towers and substation equipment, would be minor and impacts associated with incompatible uses would be less than significant.			
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	■
	e) The project would not impact emergency access in the project area.			
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	■
	f) The project would not impact parking capacity in the project area.			
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	■
	g) The project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation in the project area or vicinity, and would therefore have no impact on alternative transportation.			

4.2.16 Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	■
	a) The project would not substantially increase wastewater generation and would have no impact associated with exceedence of wastewater treatment requirements.			
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	■
	b) The project would not include construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, and would therefore have no impact associated with environmental effects of expanding such facilities.			
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	■

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c) The project would not require or result in the construction of additional storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, and would have no impact associated with environmental effects of expanding such facilities.			
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	■
	d) The project would require minimal water supplies and would result in no impact to existing supplies and entitlements.			
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	■
	e) The project would require no increase in wastewater treatment and would have no impact associated with wastewater treatment capacity.			
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	■
	f) Project construction would generate minor amounts of waste, and project operation would generate only negligible amounts of waste. Waste would be disposed of in a facility with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects disposal needs, and would therefore have no impact associated with solid waste disposal.			
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	■
	g) Project construction and operation would comply with all statutes and regulations related to solid waste and would have no impact associated with solid waste generation or disposal.			

4.2.17 Mandatory Findings of Significance

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	■	☐
	a) The project would not degrade the quality of the environment or substantially reduce habitat such that a fish or wildlife population would drop below self-sustaining levels. Neither would it eliminate a plant or animal community, nor significantly impact a rare or endangered plan to animal, nor eliminate important historic resources. Biological or cultural impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level, as explained in Chapter 6 Biological Resources and Chapter 7 Cultural Resources of this PEA.			
b) Result in impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	■	☐
	b) The project would not result in considerable cumulative impacts, as explained in Chapter 18 of this PEA.			
c) Result in environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	■	☐
	c) The project would not result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, as explained in Chapter 5 Air Quality, Chapter 12 Noise, Chapter 13 Public Health and Safety, and Chapter 17 Corona and Induced Current Effects all contained within this PEA.			